

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested. Support for the amendment can be found, e.g., in FIG. 1 of the subject Specification.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the Amendments to claims 1 and 9 overcome the Examiner's objections.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 AND 103:

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 3, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Perkins (US 4,508,024 – hereinafter Perkins). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 4, item 7, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Alternatively, in the Office Action, at page 5, item 8, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9, 11, 13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Castillo et al. (U.S. 5,372,121 - hereinafter Castillo). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 8, item 9, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins taken alone in view of Hennick (U.S. 5,189,945 - hereinafter Hennick). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Alternatively, in the Office Action, at page 8, item 10, the Examiner rejected claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of Castillo, and further in view of Hennick. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Amended, independent claim 1 recites: "...a cabinet; at least two heating units disposed in the cabinet; a grill unit disposed in the cabinet such that food laid thereon is cooked by heat from the heating units; and a cover covering the food, defining a cooking space thereunder, and having an air ventilation structure serving as a primary conduit of air into and out of the cooking space during cooking, when the cover is in a closed position, the cover being removably disposed on a top of the cabinet, wherein the air ventilation structure comprises opposing side portions of the cover, each with at least one air inlet hole, to allow inflow of the air therethrough during cooking, and the heating units are disposed along a first axis at opposing ends of an interior space of the cabinet, and the air inlet holes are disposed in the cover at opposing ends of a second axis transverse to the first axis, such that the inlet holes do not face the heating units."

And amended, independent claim 9 recites: "...a cabinet; a pair of heating units disposed at opposing ends of an interior space of the cabinet along a first axis; a grill unit disposed in the cabinet; and a cover, removably disposed on a top of the cabinet and defining a cooking space between the grill unit and the cover, with an air inlet, comprising at least two inlet holes disposed at opposing sides of the cover, and serving as a primary inlet of air into the cooking space when the cover is in a closed position, the inlet holes being positioned along a second axis transverse to the first axis such that the inlet holes do not face the heating units, to prevent outside air in the vicinity of the air inlet from being heated by the heating units, and an air outlet to ventilate the air out of the cooking space when the cover is in the closed position."

Regarding Perkins, the Examiner asserts that due to the presence of baffle plates 88, the intake vents 63 do not "face" burner elements 87. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Baffle plates 88, as shown in FIG. 6 of Perkins, do not extend vertically below the top of intake vents 63, and thus, do not prevent the intake vents 63 from facing the burner elements 87.

Further, if as asserted by the Examiner, the entirety of cover 62 and base 58 correspond to the claimed cover, then Perkins neither discloses nor suggests a cabinet in which heating elements and grill units are disposed in, and on which a cover is disposed.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as interpreted by the Examiner, none of Perkins Castillo, or Hennick, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest every element of the claims, arranged as required by the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 9 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5, and 7, which depend from independent claim 1, and claims 11, 13, 15-17, and 19, which depend from independent claim 9, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 9, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 8, 2006

By: 
Michael A. Bush
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501